

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/823,554 | 04/14/2004 | Richard G. Bergman | 51630.000078 | 4417 |
| 21967 | 7590 09/28/2006 | | EXAMINER | |
| | & WILLIAMS LLP | QURESHI, AFSAR M | | |
| INTELLECT 1900 K STRI | 'UAL PROPERTY DEPAR' FET NW | TMENT | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| SUITE 1200 | | | 2616 | |
| WASHINGT | ON, DC 20006-1109 | | | |

DATE MAILED: 09/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | cK |
|--|---|---|-------------|
| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/823,554 | BERGMAN ET AL. | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Afsar M. Qureshi | 2616 | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication ap | | | ss |
| Period for Reply | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | DATE OF THIS COMMUN 136(a). In no event, however, may will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO e, cause the application to become | IICATION. a reply be timely filed ONTHS from the mailing date of this commu ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | · |
| Status | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 A | April 2004. | | |
| ,— · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | s action is non-final. | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowa | | atters, prosecution as to the me | erits is |
| closed in accordance with the practice under the | · | · | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>38-46</u> is/are pending in the applicatio | nn. | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>38-46</u> is/are rejected. | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o | or election requirement. | | |
| Application Papers | | | |
| 9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine | ar. | | |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc | | hy the Evaminer | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct | | • | 121/4\ |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex | | | |
| | Naminor. Noto the attack | onico Action of Ionn't 10-1 | 02 . |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign | priority under 35 U.S.C. | § 119(a)-(d) or (f). | |
| a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: | | | |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority document | | | |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority document | | | |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio | | n received in this National Stac | је |
| application from the International Bureau | • | t received | |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list | or the certified copies no | LICOCIVEU. | |
| | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | |
| 1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) Interview | Summary (PTO-413) | |
| 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | _ Paper No | (s)/Mail Date | |
| 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/21/2004. | 5) Notice of Other: | Informal Patent Application | |
| | | | |

Art Unit: 2616

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

1. Claims 38-45 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 18-25, respectively, of U.S. Patent No. 6,798,772. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the limitation claimed in claim 18 of the above Patent, "wherein the Call Router Server comprises means for providing limited access to a private line using a public line", although not included in the instant Application claim 38,

Application/Control Number: 10/823,554 Page 3

Art Unit: 2616

it is, nonetheless, obvious to one skilled in the art, that the omitted limitation is not critical in making the invention.

- 2. Claim 46 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 26 of U.S. Patent No. 6,798,772. Claim 46 of the Application is a method claim. However, all the method steps claimed herein are performed in the system claim 26 of Patent No. 6,798,772 and would be obvious to one skilled in the art that the Access Server, Call Router Server and Database Server perform the claimed method steps of Application claim 46.
- 3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Afsar M. Qureshi whose telephone number is (571) 272 3178. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar can be reached on (571) 272 7488. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/823,554 Page 4

Art Unit: 2616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AFSAR QURESHI PRIMARY EXAMINER

9/26/2006